

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/810,416	CHEN, LU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dean O. Takaoka	2817	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Dean O. Takaoka.

(3) _____

(2) Siegmer Silber.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 17 January 2007

Time: 4:35pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. 102/103

Claims discussed:

1,2,9,10,19

Prior art documents discussed:

Hauer, Russell and Chaturvedi

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was the position of the Examiner that the independent claims remained rejected by the prior art. The prior art and the current application were discussed where, with respect to arguments presented on page 14 and directed to Fig. 7, it was agreed the prior art did not teach or suggest limitations with respect to the filters response to flatten the coupling response outside of the usable band of the coupler. It was agreed to amend the above claims by Examiner's amendment in order to advance prosecution and place the claims in condition for allowance. Regarding claim 2, it was further agreed to amend "optional" to avoid rejections under 112 second paragraph and with respect to dependent claim 4..